

PATENT
10/082,745

REMARKS

Examiner's Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner for the telephone interview granted to their Attorney on March 29, 2005. In this interview, Attorney attempted to point out that the primary reference, the Borland text is not an anticipatory reference under 35 USC 102. In order to reject under 35 USC 102, the reference must teach every element of the invention without modification. Borland does not do this. It would require modification even for an obviousness rejection under 35 USC 103.

The Examiner indicated that she considered the term "swap" as used in the claims herein as being broad enough to read on a position change sequence in more than one step as in the Borland text. Although Applicants believe that the claims herein use the term "swap" to define over Borland, Applicants have amended the claims in an attempt to satisfy Examiner's reservations. The claims as amended now expressly exclude from "swap" any changes in position described in Borland.

Applicants' Argument:

Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) over Borland; "Running Microsoft Word 97".

The primary reference the Borland text is not an anticipatory reference under 35 USC 102. In order to reject under 35 USC 102, the reference must teach every element of the invention without modification. Borland does not do this. It would require modification even for an obviousness rejection under 35 USC 103.

AUS920010933US1

7

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT
10/082,745

The present invention claims a swap function i.e. the user points to a first text segment, then points to a second segment, then hits a swap function, and the two text segments are swapped, i.e. exchanged in positions. Borland does not swap: he points to a first segment, then points to a position for the first segment, and then moves the first segment to the pointed to position. Borland then points to and moves a second segment in the same manner. The result may be the same but it is achieved in a completely different manner from the swap of the present invention. There is no swapping i.e. direct exchange of positions of the swapped text in a single operation in Borland.

As set forth above, the Examiner is concerned with the possible breadth of the claims. Although Applicants believe that the claims as originally filed clearly define the invention over Borland, they have amended the claims in order to expedite the present prosecution. The claims as amended set forth that the swapping of designated text segments is carried out directly in a single step or operation. The claims as amended now expressly exclude from "swap" any changes in position described in Borland.

Claims 8, 16, and 24 are submitted to be unobvious over the Borland text in view of Aratani et al (US6,538,675) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Dependent claims 8, 16, and 24 are submitted to be patentable for the reasons set forth above for the independent claims from which these claims depend. In addition to the swapped text, these claims set forth that the swapped text segments also include images. All Aratani discloses is that an image, e.g. a cursor may be selected from a list or menu of such images and substituted for the currently displayed cursor image. This is not a swap; the

AUS920010933US1

8

PATENT
10/082,745

positions of the images are not exchanged. A new cursor image is merely selected from a menu and substituted for the current cursor image. The current cursor image is not moved back to the position of the new image in the menu.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-24 are submitted to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

J. B. Kraft 5/03/05

J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
Marilyn Smith Dawkins
IPLaw Dept.-MAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758

AUS920010933US1

9

BEST AVAILABLE COPY